7k

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,786	08/31/2001	Michel Shane Simpson	NO078/100002	1045

7590   05/02/2006

Michael T Sanderson Esq
King & Schickli PLLc
247 North Broadway
Lexington, KY 40507

EXAMINER
LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/943,786	SIMPSON ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Anh Ly	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 January 2006</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>21-41</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicants' Pre-Appeal Brief Request for

Review filed on 01/09/2006.

2.   Claims 21-41 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering

patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that

the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any

inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a

later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35

U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 21-35, and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,470,332 issued to Weschler in view of US

Patent No.: 5,491,817 issued to Gopal et al. (hereinafter Gopal).

With respect to claim 21, Weschler teaches a computer system

comprising: a directory shell able to reference two or more disparate directory

each having a directory class (a program or application that maintains the

directories in the X.500 is called Directory Server Agent (DSA) and these

directories is meta-directories having at least two disparate directories within an

enterprise: col. 4, lines 26-58), the directory class in one of the directories being

dissimilar in directory objects and data from the directory class in another of the

directories (each directory has a different name of attribute, dissimilar with each

another: fig. 3, col. 8, lines 28-63);

an administrator utility with the directory shell configurable to associate the

directory class in the one of the directories to the directory class in the another of

the directories (administrator will use the software application to access and

process data or search/locate the object in the directories that are under LDAP or

X.500 environment: col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 38-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35).

Weschler teaches searching or querying or locating the object via the

disparate directories under X.500 or LDAP compliant directories over the

computer network as shown in fig. 1. Weschler does not clearly teach a directory

browser with the directory shell whereby users can search the directory classes

with a single query of the user-searchable category.

However, Gopal teaches using user interface to query the object in the

directory via a inputted query from the user (abstract, col. 3, lines 8-55 and col.8,

lines 22-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler with

the teachings of Gopal, wherein the LDAP directory tree including a plurality of

object classes of the directory class in the system provided therein (Weschler's

col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35), would incorporate the use of searching

directory tree having more than two different directories to be displayed, in the

same conventional manner as described by Gopal (col. col. 8, lines 22-45). The

motivation being for enabling a user to retrieve information in response to queries

from directory users, and allowing a user to access directory information about

an object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in

another context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 22, Weschler teaches wherein the two or more

disparate directories are managed on a plurality of servers in communication with

a computer onto which the directory shell is loaded ((see fig. 1 and fig. 2).

With respect to claim 23, Weschler teaches a computer system as

discussed in the claim 21.

Weschler teaches searching or querying or locating the object via the

disparate directories under X.500 or LDAP compliant directories over the

computer network as shown in fig. 1. Weschler does not clearly teach including a

directory interface operable to send the single query.

However, Gopal teaches using user interface to query the object in the

directory via a inputted query from the user (abstract, col. 3, lines 8-55 and col.8,

lines 22-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler with the teachings of Gopal, wherein the LDAP directory tree including a plurality of object classes of the directory class in the system provided therein (Weschler's col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35), would incorporate the use of searching directory tree having more than two different directories to be displayed, in the same conventional manner as described by Gopal (col. col. 8, lines 22-45). The motivation being for enabling a user to retrieve information in response to queries from directory users, and allowing a user to access directory information about an object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in another context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 24, Weschler teaches further including a director driver for each of the two or more disparate directories to allow the directory interface to communicate therewith (fig. 1, internet for communicating between the directories).

With respect to claim 25, Weschler teaches wherein the user-searchable category includes a category attribute mapped to one or more class attributes of the directory class (abstract, fig. 3).

With respect to claim 26, Weschler teaches wherein the directory browser includes one of a list panel and a details panel where users can view search results of the single query (col. 3, lines 20-38 and col. 7, lines 50-67 and col. 8, lines 1-28).

With respect to claim 27, Weschler teaches wherein the administrator utility

Further includes a table for associating the directory class in the one of the

directories to the directory class in the another of directories (fig. 3, different

directories with different name of class attribute).

With respect to claim 28, Weschler teaches a method of searching in a

computer system (abstract and col. 5, lines 38-45; fig. 3), comprising:

providing a directory shell with an administrator utility and a directory

browser for loading onto a computer; and enabling the administrator utility to

associate directory classes into a single user-searchable category (a program or

application that maintains the directories in the X.500 is called Directory Server

Agent (DSA) and these directories is meta-directories having at least two

disparate directories within an enterprise: col. 4, lines 26-58; each directory has a

different name of attribute, dissimilar with each another: fig. 3, col. 8, lines 28-63;

and administrator will use the software application to access and process data or

search/locate the object in the directories that are under LDAP or X.500

environment: col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 38-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35).

Weschler teaches searching or querying or locating the object via the

disparate directories under X.500 or LDAP compliant directories over the

computer network as shown in fig. 1. Weschler does not clearly teach from the

directory browser, enabling direct searching of the directory classes with a single

query of the user-searchable category.

However, Gopal teaches using user interface to query the object in the directory via a inputted query from the user (abstract, col. 3, lines 8-55 and col.8, lines 22-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler with the teachings of Gopal, wherein the LDAP directory tree including a plurality of object classes of the directory class in the system provided therein (Weschler's col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35), would incorporate the use of searching directory tree having more than two different directories to be displayed, in the same conventional manner as described by Gopal (col. col. 8, lines 22-45). The motivation being for enabling a user to retrieve information in response to queries from directory users, and allowing a user to access directory information about an object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in another context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 29, Weschler teaches a method as discussed in the claim 28.

Weschler teaches searching or querying or locating the object via the disparate directories under X.500 or LDAP compliant directories over the computer network as shown in fig. 1. Weschler does not clearly teach includes mapping a category attribute of the single user-searchable category to one or more class attributes of the directory class.

However, Gopal teaches using user interface to query the object in the

directory via a inputted query from the user (abstract, col. 3, lines 8-55 and col.8,

lines 22-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler with

the teachings of Gopal, wherein the LDAP directory tree including a plurality of

object classes of the directory class in the system provided therein (Weschler's

col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35), would incorporate the use of searching

directory tree having more than two different directories to be displayed, in the

same conventional manner as described by Gopal (col. col. 8, lines 22-45). The

motivation being for enabling a user to retrieve information in response to queries

from directory users, and allowing a user to access directory information about

an object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in

another context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 30, Weschler teaches including displaying search

results of the single query on a panel of the directory browser (col. 9, lines 15-

63).

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it is directed to a

computer readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same

reason as applied to the claim 28 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 32, Weschler teaches a computer system (fig. 1),

comprising:

a directory shell for loading on a computer in communication with one or more servers having two or more disparate directories each with a directory class), the directory class in one of the directories being dissimilar in directory objects and data from the directory class in another of the directories, the directory shell having an administrator utility and a directory browser; a table in the administrator utility configurable to associate the directory class

in the one of the directories to the directory class in the another of the directories, the result of associating the directory classes being a user-searchable category; and a panel in the directory browser where users can view search results (a program or application that maintains the directories in the X.500 is called Directory Server Agent (DSA) and these directories is meta-directories having at least two disparate directories within an enterprise: col. 4, lines 26-58; each directory has a different name of attribute, dissimilar with each another: fig. 3, col. 8, lines 28-63; and administrator will use the software application to access and process data or search/locate the object in the directories that are under LDAP or X.500 environment: col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 38-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35).

Weschler teaches searching or querying or locating the object via the disparate directories under X.500 or LDAP compliant directories over the computer network as shown in fig. 1. Weschler does not clearly teach a query portion in the directory browser whereby users can directly search the directory classes of the two or more disparate directories with a single query of the user-searchable category.

However, Gopal teaches using user interface to query the object in the directory via a inputted query from the user (abstract, col. 3, lines 8-55 and col.8, lines 22-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler with the teachings of Gopal, wherein the LDAP directory tree including a plurality of object classes of the directory class in the system provided therein (Weschler's col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35), would incorporate the use of searching directory tree having more than two different directories to be displayed, in the same conventional manner as described by Gopal (col. col. 8, lines 22-45). The motivation being for enabling a user to retrieve information in response to queries from directory users, and allowing a user to access directory information about an object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in another context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 33, Weschler teaches wherein the query portion and the panel are on a same page of the directory browser (fig. 3).

With respect to claim 34, Weschler teaches wherein the table includes one or more check boxes for the associating of the directory classes (col. 3, lines 20-38: graphical user interface with icon or check boxes).

With respect to claim 35, Weschler teaches wherein the table includes an enable column to indicate directory classes associated with the user-searchable category (fig. 3; abstract, col. 5, lines 52-64 and col. 9, lines 1-14).

With respect to claim 37, Weschler teaches a method of searching in a computer system (abstract and col. 5, lines 38-45; fig. 3), comprising:

creating a single user-searchable category from directory classes; directly searching the directory classes of the two or more disparate directories with a single query of the user-searchable category, the directly searching substantially avoiding creating or using a virtual directory (a program or application that maintains the directories in the X.500 is called Directory Server Agent (DSA) and these directories is meta-directories having at least two disparate directories within an enterprise: col. 4, lines 26-58; each directory has a different name of attribute, dissimilar with each another: fig. 3, col. 8, lines 28-63; and administrator will use the software application to access and process data or search/locate the object in the directories that are under LDAP or X.500 environment: col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 38-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35).

Weschler teaches searching or querying or locating the object via the disparate directories under X.500 or LDAP compliant directories over the computer network as shown in fig. 1. Weschler does not clearly teach from the directory browser, enabling direct searching of the directory classes with a single query of the user-searchable category.

However, Gopal teaches using user interface to query the object in the directory via a inputted query from the user (abstract, col. 3, lines 8-55 and col.8, lines 22-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler with

the teachings of Gopal, wherein the LDAP directory tree including a plurality of object classes of the directory class in the system provided therein (Weschler's col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-35), would incorporate the use of searching directory tree having more than two different directories to be displayed, in the same conventional manner as described by Gopal (col. col. 8, lines 22-45). The motivation being for enabling a user to retrieve information in response to queries from directory users, and allowing a user to access directory information about an object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in another context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 38, Weschler teaches wherein the creating further includes associating, in an administrator utility, the directory class in the one of the directories to the directory class in the another of the directories (fig. 1 and fig. 3 and col. 9, lines 15-64).

With respect to claim 39, Weschler teaches wherein creating further includes creating additional user-searchable categories for additional directory classes of the two or more directories (fig. 3).

With respect to claim 40, Weschler teaches wherein the creating further includes providing a directory shell for loading on a computer in communication with one or more servers having the two or more disparate directories (fig. 1 and fig. 3; abstract and col. 9, lines 15-64; also col. 5, lines 38-64).

Claim 41 is essentially the same as claim 37 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 37 hereinabove.

6.   Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent No. 6,470,332 issued to Weschler in view of US Patent No.: 5,491,817

issued to Gopal et al. (hereinafter Gopal) and further in view of US Patent No.

6,260,039 issued to Schneck et al. (hereinafter Schneck).

With respect to claim 36, Weschler in view of Gopal discloses a computer

system as discussed in claim 32.

Weschler and Gopal disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Weschler and Gopal do not teach directory browser is formatted to be

displayed in HTML format.

However, Schneck teaches HTML format (displaying in HTML format: col.

7, lines 18-48 and col. 8, lines 32-45; also see figs 10-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Weschler in

view of Gopal with the teachings of Schneck by incorporating the use of a HTML

format for displayed information. The motivation being for enabling a user to

search information and display the search result in HTML format (Schneck's col.

1, lines 15-20), and allowing a user to access directory information about an

object in one context by knowing directory information about the object in another

context (Gopal's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 5, lines 5-10).

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **or fax to (571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY
MAR. 22nd, 2006